



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/649,512

Filing Date: August 26, 2003

Applicant: Takeshi HAGIWARA

Group Art Unit: 2871

Examiner: Huyen Le Ngo

Title: ELECTRO-OPTICAL DEVICE AND ELECTRONIC APPARATUS

Attorney Docket: 9319S-000224/DVA

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450


COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which “the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear [the Examiner’s] reasons for allowing a claim or claims.” 37 C.F.R. 1.104 (e). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted, especially since the statement may unfairly focus on certain reasons for allowance which are not reflected by the prosecution history. Therefore, the record should reflect that Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. For example, while Applicant believes the claims are allowable, Applicant may not unequivocally agree that patentability resides

solely in the specific feature or combination of features identified, or that each feature or combination of features identified is required for patentability, or that equivalents of any of the recited features are outside the scope of the claims. Moreover, to the extent the reasons for allowance do not separately address the subject matter of all the claims, Applicant does not acquiesce to any inference that the non-addressed claims fail to present other reasons for patentability apart from the patentability of the claims which were specifically addressed by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept 8, 2005

By: 
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/jmz